THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 111, NO. 6 NEW YORK, MONDAY, AUGUST 7, 1944 NUMBER 1549

Slowness in Normandy

There has been a good deal of criticism from correspondents on the Normandy front, mainly to the effect that the Allied tactics there have been insufficiently daring, particularly in the use of armor. The American break-through between St. Lo and Periers will doubtless silence some of this, because it's hard to argue with a victory, though unless the British also achieve a break-through in the offensive just starting as this is written, there is still likely to be some moaning on the British side of the bar.

This criticism, however, misses the central point. It is probably true that we have, except in prisoners, been taking about as many casualties as we have given in Normandy. It is certainly true that the two and three-mile advances there compare very unfavorably with the twenty and thirty-mile Russian advances which are the real cause of the crisis within the Reich. But it is a different kind of war and in more than one way.

Forced to Improvise

It is different firstly because the Russians are operating on their original plan, whereas there is every evidence that the Allied officers in Normandy have been forced to improvise a plan. The extreme reliance on air power which has been a feature of the British-American campaign ever since the original landing, has been perhaps overdone. The attempt to use planes for barrage and interdiction work and not merely as a weapon of harassment and against communication lines was certainly not justified by what happened when it was tried at Cassino. Still, the Allied officers had the experience at Cassino to go on and presumably they improved the technique of bombardment. One of the releases referring to the incident in which some of the bombs struck within American lines shows that medium bombers were employed in pattern bombing from low levels—that is, a formation secured positions over a pattern of targets to be hit and all released their bombs at once. This has been done by British bombers from high levels against such targets as factories; it is the first time anyone has mentioned pattern bombing by the fast American mediums at low level and on the battlefield. But it does not seem there was enough of this bombing, that it was accurate enough or produced enough effect really to furnish a substitute for artillery.

Bombers as Artillery

In fact, the plan of using bombers to do most of the work normally assigned to heavy guns would seem to have been undertaken because the Allied leaders expected to encounter difficulties in moving sufficient heavy artillery to the front through the extremely limited port and road facilities available. Quite evidently they have had the anticipated difficulty; they have also had a totally unexpected one in encountering about the worst weather for a planned type of campaign since Napoleon was in Spain in 1808. Bombing, which is not altogether a form of artillery, has been found to obtain its maximum effect by continuity; and continuity is precisely what it has been unable to obtain since the sixth of June.

Generals Eisenhower, Montgomery, Bradley, Dempsey—all of them—were thus in effect driven to improvise new methods or to adopt second-bests which they anticipated would not quite do. It was not boldness that was lacking on their part, but material resources, particularly in heavy equipment. In addition, a large percentage of their troops seemed to have been green.

CONTENTS

The Week 147
Editorial
Stop Argentina Now! 150
General Articles
The Liberals after Chicago . . Bruce Bliven 152
The Crisis in Germany . . Karl O. Paetel 154
Poland and Russia . . . Heinz H. F. Eulau 156
The Land Stacks Up (verse) . . . . . Preston Newman 157
The Press and Public Opinion: II . . . . . Gerhart Saenger 158
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 160
It Comes Up Corn . . . . Manny Farber 161
The Bandwagon 161
Correspondence 162
Books in Review
The Road to Peace . . . . Albert Guérard 163
Henry Wallace's Democracy . . . . . Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt 165
A Reader's List 166

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1944, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Attrition and German Morale

This is the really essential difference between the campaign in Normandy and that in Russia. The Allies in France are still doing the kind of fighting the Soviets were in 1942, with only the difference that they are on the offensive. Men, and especially the junior officers up to major, lack that battle experience for which it has again and again been proved that there is no substitute. Until this experience is attained, the campaign in Normandy is necessarily one of attrition, as the 1942 Russian campaign was. There is some evidence that the Soviets in that campaign relieved their formation at the front very frequently to spread experience as far as possible.There is abundant evidence that the Allied commanders in Normandy are doing exactly the same thing.

While this experience is being gained, while this process of attrition is going on, it is idle to expect large victories and sweeping advances. As a matter of fact, if the territorial gains in Normandy have been somewhat "behind schedule" (that favorite phrase of the correspondents) the other gains have been well beyond any reasonable expectation. There have been checks but no real setbacks, no Allied lines driven in, no big batches of prisoners lost as at Anzio. On the other hand, the number of German prisoners has been far beyond what might have been expected and is well ahead of that for similar periods in Africa and Italy. And in the present condition of the German Army a war of attrition which causes them to lose prisoners is far more serious than a big battle in which they lose a similar number of men in killed and wounded. Morale is now the most serious question for the German Army, and when a force loses prisoners the fact can never be so concealed that it will not affect morale.

Dewey and Fish

Governor Dewey did the decent and necessary thing in repudiating the candidacy of Congressman Hamilton Fish for reëlection. It does not detract in the least from the credit due him for his statement to add that it was smart politics. The ground he chose—the candidate's use of religious and racial prejudice—is not only one of the worst of Mr. Fish's offenses against American democracy, but it is one on which Mr. Dewey may hope to gain some votes, or at least to avoid losing any.

It was more to be expected that Fish would also be opposed by Mr. Willkie, since the Representative is one of the most notorious of the isolationist crowd which Mr. Willkie has been fighting within his party. Mr. Dewey would deserve still more praise if he attacked Mr. Fish on this score also, since there are many isolationist votes in the party which he might lose, and Mr. Bricker has come very close to courting them. Mr. Willkie characteristically did more than he needed to do—as Mr. Dewey did not—by accompanying his repudiation with an offer to defend Mr. Fish's detractors against a threatened libel suit.

Time to Talk to the Germans

A debate in the House of Commons a fortnight ago reflected an uneasiness that must be widespread in the democratic countries participating in the war. Several members of the House made the point that insisting on unconditional surrender for Germany was perhaps prolonging the war needlessly, by causing the Germans to fight to the last man. The attempted assassination of Hitler (assuming it was genuine) should strengthen the hand of these critics, by indicating that there is widespread dissatisfaction with the war in Germany and a desire to make peace.

Few would suggest that the demand for unconditional surrender be canceled. Obviously it is important that the Germans should never again have a chance to say, as they did after the First World War, that they were tricked into surrender by the promise of peace terms which were then not carried out. But we can demand unconditional surrender and at the same time give the Germans some sort of idea of the world in which they are to live. At present, Hitler and Goebbels tell their people that the Allies are preparing the most dreadful punishments for the entire German population and the Allies make no attempt to dispute these statements. Yet, we are not consistent in our demand that the Axis surrender unconditionally. We have already told Japan a great part of what her terms will be. Russia offered definite peace terms to Finland, and also indicated in a general way the nature of her policy in the Balkans if Rumania and Bulgaria were to come out of the war.

The Russian Example

The British government's replies to the questions asked in the House sounded as though agreements had been made at Teheran for dealing with Germany that were so drastic the leaders don't dare tell them to the British and American people. But if this is true, public opinion in those countries will not support the terms when they are finally revealed, and in the long run they will not be enforced. It was formerly thought that Russia was demanding a savage peace, and that the British and Americans want milder terms; but this theory does not accord with the known facts. Russia's terms to Finland were severe but certainly not Carthaginian. In that part of Rumania which she has occupied she is letting the Rumanians strictly alone, without even canceling anti-Semitic ordinances. The Russians have on more than one occasion appealed to German soldiers and workers to rise against the Nazi tyranny. There is no reason why we cannot do the same, and at the same time promise any genuinely democratic Germans that they will not be utterly de-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stroyed. The lives of many thousands of British and American troops may be saved if our leaders will only speak out now.

Political Notes

Three more conservatives went down to defeat last week—Senator "Cotton Ed" Smith of South Carolina, Senator Hattie Caraway of Arkansas, and Representative Richard Kleberg of Texas. They will now sit on the sidelines along with Costello of California, Starnes of Alabama, Holman of Oregon and a couple of men who did not choose to run, Reynolds of North Carolina and Dies of Texas. The three new victories are further evidence that the people of the United States are in a progressive frame of mind, whatever may be true of the political bosses.

Progressives in Arkansas now have a chance to do their good deed for the week by voting for Representative Fulbright in the run-off election on August 8. Mr. Fulbright, a former university president and Rhodes scholar, has made a good impression for a newcomer to Washington. While he has six minus votes out of eighteen in the latest New Republic chart, he is far superior in every way to his opponent.

In Wisconsin, Senator Alexander Wiley is up for renomination in the Republican primary on August 15. Mr. Wiley voted right only seven times out of the eighteen recorded in The New Republic, and deserves to be defeated. In the Wisconsin Democratic senatorial primary, progressive members of that party will of course support Howard McMurray, who has been a member of the House from the Fifth Wisconsin District, and one of the best men Wisconsin has sent to Washington in a generation. Mr. McMurray's is one of the few perfect records for progressivism in The New Republic chart.

Attacking the PAC

American Tories are terrified at the number of their spokesmen in Congress who have gone down to defeat in the past few weeks. They obviously believe that the CIO Political Action Committee has had much to do with it, but they cannot quite make up their minds what is the best method to use to belittle the PAC. Alternately they describe it as a dreadful menace which is communist-controlled, and as an ineffectual popgun which (this is a favorite theory) by supporting Wallace caused him to be defeated in Chicago.

A vicious campaign of attack on the PAC is now in progress in the reactionary press. The worst articles we have seen have been those in the Scripps-Howard newspapers and of them all, the low-water mark is reached in a couple of effusions by Henry J. Taylor, the reactionary publicist who keeps insisting he is just a plain business man but spends his time writing and speaking on the radio against labor and liberalism. Mr. Taylor sneers at Sidney Hillman as "a Lithuanian"; creates out of whole cloth a series of supposed bridges between Hillman and the communists; talks without any justification in fact of a "three-million-dollar slush fund"; goes through a list of about a hundred American liberals who are members of the National Citizens Political Action Committee and picks out for mention, ignoring all the others, the two or three that sound most foreign; makes the utterly nonsensical charge that the PAC has been abolished and the NCPAC has taken its place. If you want to have the cold chills go down your spine read these Henry J. Taylor articles in the Scripps-Howard newspapers of July 21 and July 24, and then go back and read Goebbels' propaganda in the days when the Nazis were coming to power in Germany.

Congress Should Stay on the Job

Congress is intending to reconvene for a few days only and then take a long recess, perhaps until after the election. We agree warmly with Senator Dennis Chavez that every possible pressure should be brought to bear to keep the members in Washington. These are among the most fateful hours in our history; events are moving with tremendous rapidity in both the European and the Asiatic theatres of war; and it is a disgraceful spectacle for the members of our national parliament to spend three months doing nothing but getting themselves reëlected (two-thirds of the Senate, of course, are not running). It is high time that Congress went to work on the problems of demobilization and reconversion; if it doesn't, we may have millions of unemployed in this country before the snow flies. Another important job is to strike off completely the shackles which prevent purveying political information to members of the armed forces. Our soldiers are citizens; anything that is fit to be read by civilians is fit for the fighting men. The theory that they must be insulated against political discussion could only arise in minds, whether inside or outside the army, that are without faith in the fundamental democratic process.

Pease in The Newark Evening News

What Worse Than He Has Done?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Democrats and the Negro Vote

The Republican platform this year made four promises to Negroes. It advocated a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee, anti-lynching legislation, a constitutional amendment against the poll tax and a congressional inquiry into discrimination against Negroes in the army. The Democratic platform offered none of these things. It merely said piously that "racial and religious minorities have the right to live, develop and vote equally with all citizens and share the rights that are guaranteed by the Constitution." Many Negroes consider this just a run-around. Leaders of the race say that as things now stand, large numbers of them will vote for Dewey, perhaps enough to swing the election against Mr. Roosevelt. To win the Negroes back, the Democrats will need to act, not merely to orate. Senator Dennis Chavez of New Mexico, warning his fellow Democrats of the danger, says they should take the lead in putting legislation for a permanent FEPC through Congress at once. This sounds to us like extremely good advice. We hope the Democrats will have sense enough to take it. Any white men who could take offense at such action live in the Solid South, which is sure to go Democratic in any case; but millions of Negroes now live in the North, in states every one of which is doubtful in this year's election.

Wallace Fights On

Henry Wallace, speaking to the Platform Committee of the Iowa State Democratic Convention a few days ago, laid down a sound line of action for himself and other progressives for the immediate future. While we fight to reëlect President Roosevelt, he told his fellow Iowans, we must also keep up the fight for a "liberal, constructive Democratic Party." Workers and farmers must be given a sympathetic understanding of each other's problems. The South and the West must continue to stand together. "The Republican Party and its organs of publicity," he said, "have tried to separate the farmer and the worker. The Democratic Party can succeed only if it brings the farmer and the worker together on a liberal, constructive platform. Those Democrats who fight such a program are Republicans wearing false faces." In the South, he predicted, "more and more an intelligent, constructive, liberal leadership will arise which will not owe anything directly or indirectly to Wall Street or to outworn prejudices. Claude Pepper of Florida and Ellis Arnall of Georgia illustrate what I mean. Watch these men. They are young and have a sense of future trend."

Turkey's Dilemma

There is a touch of the ludicrous in the rumors that Turkey may soon break diplomatic relations with Germany and perhaps declare war on her. For years, when the going was tough, the Allies tried to high-pressure Turkey into joining the United Nations. Now, when the Germans are preparing to evacuate the Balkans without much resistance, Turkey is trying to convince the Allies of her usefulness as a partner in war. That the Allies are wise to Turkey's last-minute effort to jump on the United Nations' bandwagon, lest she be left out of the peace settlement, appears from their reluctance to grant her the military supplies which she would like to get in exchange for the proposed belligerency. It is believed that Stalin prevailed on his fellow conferees at Teheran not to give in to Turkey's blackmail diplomacy. Since then the Turks have sought an early rapprochement with the Soviet Union, their traditional "good neighbor" until they signed a non-aggression pact with Germany only a few days before the invasion of Russia. Knowing that Russia's chief standard for judging a friend has been his military contribution to the enemy's defeat, Turkey would like to be a belligerent without actually having to carry the burdens of war. She must feel very embarrassed to find out now that her participation in the war is not particularly wanted by the Allied powers.

Stop Argentina Now!

HAVE THE NATIONS of the world learned the lessons of Japan, Italy, Germany, Spain and Vichy? Each of the Fascist or militarist regimes which seized power over the peoples of these nations could have been stopped before it became strong enough to upset the peace. In each case the United States and the other democratic nations failed to act until it was too late. Usually a policy of appeasement was tried in the hope that the sacrifices and dangers incident to a firm stand could be avoided. The eventual price which had to be paid was disproportionately heavy. Now a new totalitarian regime has appeared in the Western Hemisphere and is following substantially the same course as the others. It is still not too late to stop it.

The facts have been obvious for months, but too little attention has been paid to them because of concentration on the war in Europe and Asia. Secretary Hull's note tells part of the story though not all of it. A group of army officers months ago seized power and suspended the democratic procedures and the civil liberties embodied in the Argentine constitution. Contrary to the sympathies of the majority of Argentine citizens, they favored the Axis powers in foreign policy and proceeded to imitate their measures at home. Although formally Argentina broke diplomatic relations with the Axis, it has practically abetted them in every way it could. It has failed to check their espionage and has even seized supplies imported from America and Great Britain and turned them over to firms which are black-listed.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So much Secretary Hull tells us. He does not tell us, however, that Argentina is rapidly building up its military forces and seems to be nourishing aggressive designs against neighbors such as Bolivia, Chile, Paraguay, and perhaps even Uruguay and Brazil. Nor does he tell us that there is a strong suspicion that the leaders of Nazi-Fascism in Europe are transferring their wealth to Argentina and may be preparing to use it as a refuge for themselves and a home for their doctrines if they are expelled from their native countries.

How, in a democratic country with progressive educated classes and a liberal tendency, could such a movement get as far as it has? The answer is that the army officers who form the nucleus of the dictatorship are supported by a powerful landed aristocracy which is a survival of feudalism in the New World. Argentina's wealth comes largely from the land, and the best agricultural land is in enormous estates owned either by wealthy families or corporations. There is almost no class of family farmers who own their own farms. Agrarian movements have long been threatening the power of the land barons, but these owners have set their faces against agricultural reform and have maintained the arbitrary traditions of the Spanish Conquistadores. Most of them are absentees and have been accustomed to spending their incomes outside the country. They are also closely affiliated with the Argentine branch of the Catholic Church, which is for the most part conservative.

There are of course large commercial interests in Argentina, many of them supported by foreign capital. Industry too has begun to grow rapidly in recent years. The British have been heavy investors there, especially in railroads and utilities, but the Germans also have a large stake and have on the whole supplied more immigrants than the British. The industrial and commercial population, though it has high hopes for the future, is not yet a large enough factor to control public policy, and much of it is under German influence.

The principal reason, however, why there is not more vigorous objection to the present regime is that Argentina is experiencing a boom as a result of war trade, mainly with the United States and Great Britain. Britain imports large quantities of wheat, beef, hides and the like, while the United States has, at considerable sacrifice to the war effort, exported to Argentina consumption goods and materials required by a growing industry.

If an effective embargo were placed on Argentine trade by Great Britain and the United States, this prosperity would almost immediately collapse. Not only would the commercial interests suffer, but also those engaged in agriculture would lose their immensely important export market. Even a serious threat of an embargo might be enough to change the policy of the Argentine government, if not to bring about its overthrow.

As in all other cases, an embargo would cause injury to the nations placing it as well as to the object of the disciplinary action. The United States would not suffer severely by the interruption of present trade with Argentina, but Great Britain would have to look elsewhere for a substantial part of its essential imports. This country, as well as Canada and Australia, would therefore have to tighten its belt further to make up the deficiency. Probably the Argentine government thinks it can run the risk of an embargo because of the difficulty of imposing one in time of war.

Nevertheless, the sacrifice will have to be made if we are to avoid much worse dangers in the future. If trade with Argentina were effectively stopped the crisis would probably soon be over. Of course we should have to be prepared to use naval power to enforce a blockade and to meet any forcible resistance which the Argentine militarists might offer. But a little force now may save a great deal later.

The manner of taking such action is of the utmost importance. It should be joined by all the other American nations and by Great Britain. If the United Nations were now a better organized unit this would be one of its most appropriate tasks, and would be a forerunner of the policy of quarantining aggression which has been recommended for the postwar period. Another essential would be to make it clear to the Argentine people that the action was directed not against them or their sovereignty, but against their tyrannical government. We should promise them that the moment their constitutional guarantees were restored and their government fulfilled its international obligations, trade would be resumed without obstruction. It should also be pointed out that through the international economic agencies of the United Nations, they would in the postwar period have an opportunity such as never before to build up their industry and their foreign trade.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

Assistant Editors: ELIZABETH HULING, GEORGE MAYBERRY, HELEN FULLER (Washington)

Contributing Editors: H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, MALCOLM COWLEY, VARIAN FRY, JULIAN HUXLEY, ALFRED KAZIN, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, THOMAS SANCTON, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Advertising Manager: E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Liberals after Chicago

ONCE AGAIN I FIND a good many of those American liberals with whom I come into contact down in the dumps. They are heartbroken over the rejection of Henry Wallace at Chicago. They fear that the conservatives are now in complete control of both the Democratic and the Republican parties. On the world stage they see military victory not far off, but permanent world peace very far off indeed. This is because the only pattern of world order that can now be seen emerging is an attempt to continue the Anglo-American-Russian-Chinese alliance indefinitely into the future and by means of it to hold in check aggression —at least on the part of somebody else. The dismayed liberals are shocked by the cynicism of a man like Walter Lippmann, who not only expects a permanent balance of power but now glories in it, despite the fact that every earlier balance of power throughout all history has always ended in war.

Certainly, there is nothing in the immediate prospect which should cause American progressives to throw their hats in the air. The Southern conservatives and the big-city machines of the North had their way at Chicago, with the acquiescence, if not the active collaboration, of President Roosevelt. Liberals, trade-unionists and Negroes, to name only three groups, were contemptuously dismissed as being of no substantial importance compared to the tories of the South and the Northern metropolitan machines, among which Mayor Hague's Jersey City despotism is only a little bit worse than the others. You could ask no more startling contrast than the one between Vice President Wallace's unfaltering courage in his speech and the mealy-mouthed compromises which, on many issues, marked the Democratic platform.

Long before Chicago, of course, the liberals had begun to feel uneasy about developments inside both the party and the Roosevelt administration. In the dispute between Vice President Wallace and Jesse Jones, the deep-dyed reactionary Jones won an overwhelming victory. The fight over the FEPC showed the racists in control at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. One or two men like Admiral Leahy and Robert Murphy have had more influence over our policy toward France and Italy than all the exhortations of all the liberals, praying aloud in unison. A good many New Deal agencies of substantial value have been liquidated without even the benefit of crocodile tears.

A surprising number of important New Dealers have drifted away from, or been thrown out of, Washington in the past few years. Nearly all the top decisions in the government bureaus are now being made by conservatives, and a large number of them by Republican conservatives. The United States Supreme Court is almost the only group in Washington which still retains the coloration of the New Deal, to which it came so belatedly. "Free enterprise" has become a mass fetish in this country just as "back to normalcy" was in the campaign of 1920. The American people seem to be determined, as Dr. Gunnar Myrdal pointed out recently, to rush headlong into another very bad depression soon after the war.

On the international scene, prospects are certainly bleak. Mr. Churchill is even more pleased with himself, and more completely Tory than he was in the past, which is saying a lot. Mr. Stalin, whatever else he may be, is a good Russian, not a good liberal along American lines. The strength of the democratic impulse in China is suspect, to put it mildly. It is ominous that no United Nations Council has yet been formed. It is ominous—from the standpoint of permanent peace —that our enemies have been specifically reserved from the provisions of the Atlantic Charter. It is ominous that Mr. Churchill should be so intransigent about Hong Kong and India.

Does all this add up to justification for pessimism on the part of American progressives? I can't see it. If you are disheartened at this moment, it means only that you were unjustifiably optimistic a little earlier. Things haven't really gotten any worse; it is only that a great many people long thought they were better than they were.

The liberals have never constituted a majority of the people with power in the United States, though they may have done so among the people without power, the little people, those who get represented in the Gallup and Fortune polls, but rarely on the level of governmental action. Actually, liberalism showed more strength at the Chicago Democratic Convention than it has ever done before in normal times, in American politics. It was able to veto Jimmie Byrnes for Vice President. It showed so much strength that at one time the bosses were badly frightened by it, as Helen Fuller pointed out in The New Republic last week. Indeed with a little more skill, a little more preliminary work, the liberals might have won on their most important issue, the renomination of Henry Wallace.

It is worth remembering that the liberals didn't bring about the New Deal out of their strength. Historically, it was an accident; it did not, in 1932, represent the solid demand of a large mass of the American people who campaigned on this issue and won an election. It was on the contrary a series of brilliant improvisations by a President who was elected under

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the impression that he was very far from being a New Dealer, an impression which was quite correct at the time in regard to a good many of his public policies. Throughout the Roosevelt administration the forces on the left always complained that the President didn't go as far as they wanted him to. That he was able to go as far as he did, was due to the accident that the conservative elements at first were prostrated in the storm of the depression which their own economic illiteracy had brought about. By the time they had recovered and were willing and ready to take over the rule of the country again, a rule which they had never abdicated before, even temporarily, the President had caught the popular imagination and was able to get reëlected despite the tremendous power the conservatives could marshal against him.

These conservatives, thereupon, very naturally followed the good old rule: "If you can't lick 'em, join 'em." They infiltrated the Roosevelt administration, especially when war came, and when the device of the dollar-a-year man made this easy. With the war, too, the President became more and more engrossed in military matters. He felt, rightly or wrongly, that this was no time to continue a program of domestic reform. His personal popularity did not extend to other members of his party; he could get himself reëlected but he could not reëlect a New Deal House and Senate. The country drifted—or was pushed—back to normal, which means that conservative candidates had their customary advantage over liberal candidates in both parties and on all levels. These conservatives and many others, with an automatic tropism, or a cultural lag, or whatever you want to call it, went on fighting the President furiously for years without realizing that he had stopped fighting back.

No progressive needs to be told that he should work and vote for the reëlection of President Roosevelt this year. To be sure, as suggested above, he has serious faults, and there are many things about his administration—notably its foreign policy as conducted by the State Department—of which no liberal can approve. The New Republic has not hesitated to criticize him in the past when we felt it was necessary, and we shall continue to criticize him in the future, under the same circumstances. But political life is always a compromise between the ideal and the best you can possibly get. In the choice between Roosevelt plus the Democratic machine, and Dewey plus the Republican machine, I do not see how any progressive American can hesitate for a moment to choose the former.

My own rough guess is that Mr. Roosevelt will probably be reëlected, but by a margin much narrower than the polls would now indicate. It is of course too early to make any sort of intelligent prophecy, but I agree with Marquis Childs that this is one occasion on which the forecasts could easily go wrong. The Fortune poll indicates at present that Mr. Roosevelt will get about 50 percent of the vote and Mr. Dewey 42, which would suggest a victory far greater than that of 1940. But it is no trouble to cast your vote in the Fortune poll, which comes and rings your doorbell, and it is a lot of trouble to cast it in the voting place on November 7.

The Republicans will do everything they possibly can to discourage people from voting, on the well-founded conviction that the bigger the registration, the greater Mr. Roosevelt's chances. They control the state machinery in most of the populous states. Already they have managed matters so that large numbers of soldiers will be unable to vote. Literally millions of war workers have moved to new communities and will find it a burdensome task to register, even if the laws do not make it impossible as in some states they do. It is reasonable to assume that the press in the crucial Northern states will be against Mr. Roosevelt by two to one as it was in 1940. Most of the radio will be as hostile to him as it dares to be in view of its theoretical impartiality.

Northern Negroes are in a state of bitter rebellion against the Democratic Party. Unless something drastic and effective is done for them, going far beyond mere words, great numbers of them will vote for Dewey or, perhaps more probably, stay home on election day. Trade-unionists and independent liberals will certainly vote for Roosevelt; but many of them with less enthusiasm than they displayed before Chicago. They will give 70 percent support instead of 100 percent; and that is an important difference. It is possible that the race may be so close that the votes and efforts of Northern independent liberals may turn the scale. If they do, it will underline more than ever the folly of the Chicago convention which, with Mr. Roosevelt's tacit approval, acted as though all the doubtful states were in the Solid South.

The liberals' immediate job, then, is to work and vote for the reëlection of Mr. Roosevelt. They must also—and this is of the utmost importance—work and vote for the election of the best Congress it is possible to obtain. If one had to choose, it would almost be better to have a good Congress and a bad President than vice versa, since the President has to work so much of the time through federal legislation.

But with the election, the liberals' work will only have begun. They must also keep unremitting pressure on Washington to offset the unremitting pressures from the other side. They should protest, and keep on protesting, the presence of a man like Jesse Jones in the Cabinet, or the continued presence of a dozen ex-appeasers in the State Department. For the long run, they must try to teach the facts of life to as many as possible of their neighbors, against the day when the majority of our citizens wake up to the fact that full employment and high prosperity are possible only

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under certain conditions and that tremendously powerful forces are at work in this country trying to destroy those conditions and to prevent their recurrence.

The liberals' balance sheet therefore looks something like this: Despite what happened at Chicago, they are stronger at this moment than they have ever been before. They are closely allied with millions of trade unionists who are for the first time politically conscious and politically organized. They are working with all minorities who suffer discrimination. While the New Deal was historically an accident, it has resulted in great gains, most of which can be kept if we continue to be vigilant on their behalf. Witness the efforts of the Republicans this year to endorse much of what the New Deal has done.

America will almost certainly have another disastrous depression three or four years after the end of the war unless we fight hard to prevent it. This one will not be worldwide. Russia doesn't have depressions; China will be too busy industrializing herself; Great Britain will be using a compensatory Keynes-Woolton economy. But the lessons of the last depression have not been entirely wasted, even in this country. We ought to be able to skip much of the fumbling and groping which accompanied the early stages of last time.

As to international relations, there ought to be at least a breathing spell of some years before there is again real change of war. During that breathing spell, we shall have one more chance to avoid the mistakes of the 1920's, and to make the shift from imperialism and the balance of power to coöperation, collective security and a people's peace.

Here, then, is the progressives' great opportunity. As the lines are more clearly drawn here at home, as the alternatives of fascism and liberalism become sharper, there is no good reason why the progressives should not be able to capture one party or the other, probably the Democratic, and start again on a bigger and better New Deal. As Gunnar Myrdal points out, the conservatives are making fools of themselves by tying full employment to unrestricted private enterprise. They can't possibly maintain full employment, and they are setting a trap for themselves in that, when millions of unemployed reappear, they will have quite needlessly discredited private enterprise in the eyes of the plain people. Even the Americans will not go on having depression after depression if most of the rest of the world is enjoying full employment.

The tides of history are running our way. All over the world, nation after nation is moving steadily and rapidly in the direction the progressives advocate in this country. Our victories in the past twelve years have been tremendous and permanent—far more than the most optimistic would have dared to predict in 1932. Instead of being disheartened, the liberals have every cause to feel reasonably proud of the past and reasonably confident about the future. Only one real danger threatens. It is the sort of defeatism that some progressives are talking today. BRUCE BLIVEN

The Crisis in Germany

THE FACTS BEHIND what has happened and is happening in Germany are still obscure. Perhaps they will remain obscure until the end of the war, when public records are again available. We know enough, however, to be certain that these events are of tremendous historical significance.

The official German government story is that there was a plot of "a small gang of officers," that it has been suppressed and that the German people are united behind their leaders. On the other hand, dispatches from Switzerland and Sweden and broadcasts over the underground anti-Nazi radio station, "Atlantique," maintain that there have been numerous local clashes between the German Army and the Nazi troops, that these clashes continued for at least a week after the first attempt to assassinate Hitler and that Germany was at one time on the verge of a civil war. Still other reports suggest that the whole matter was a staged maneuver by the Nazis themselves, another "Reichstag fire," to give them a pretext to purge all elements known or suspected to be hostile to themselves.

It is evident that the Nazi machine has greatly tightened its grip on Germany, at least for the moment. It has taken over the few remaining key positions which it did not already have. Nevertheless, the attempted revolt has certainly accelerated the movement which had already started, for a general breakdown of German morale. Just now, the symptoms of this breakdown are suppressed more rigorously than ever; but that does not mean that they do not exist and will not soon reappear on a more serious scale than ever.

In the long run, it does not matter greatly whether the attack on Hitler was fictitious, was a genuine plot but forced into premature activity by *agents provocateurs*, or was only the bungled first step in a carefully planned revolt on a wide scale. In any case, it proves that a good many men in the regular army, navy and (this is really astonishing) the air force, were at least disaffected and perhaps ready for a desperate effort to break the grip of the Nazis on Germany and to regain for the professional military men freedom of action in questions of both domestic and foreign policy. True,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the moment these attempts have backfired: Goering has become the economic and administrative dictator, and what is still more important, Himmler, commander-in-chief of the Elite Guards and head of the Gestapo, has now taken over the control of the armed forces.

By this stroke, Himmler got direct supervision over the only part of the German Army that was not dominated by the Nazis. This was the Ersatzheer, or the Stellvertretendes Generalkommando, which might be translated as the Home Army. It had been vigorously defended against Nazi infiltration through the military branch of the SS by Colonel-General Fritz Fromm, for two years past. Himmler had tried over and over to get rid of Fromm and to replace him by a military man from the SS, but in vain. Now he has accomplished this, which may be why some commentators in neutral countries are saying that Himmler himself planted the bomb, possibly taking care that Hitler was not killed, or possibly even being indifferent as to whether this happened. Not only is Himmler chief of the police force of all Germany, Minister of the Interior and Commissioner General of the Administration of the Reich, but he is now the connecting link between the Home Army and the forces in the field.

The Home Army is of greater importance than is realized by most people outside of Germany, and more than its name indicates. Not only does it train replacements for front-line service; it is also responsible for all military transportation, whether on railroads, canals or highways. It handles military censorship, intelligence, espionage, the service of supply and the care of the wounded. Its highly trained staff of officers and non-commissioned officers constantly shuttles back and forth between Berlin, and other grand headquarters, and the actual front. Thus Himmler, and through him the Nazis themselves, are now in a strategic position of great value in regard to political activities of the professional army men.

The SS has also taken control of the only occupied territory which was not already in its hands: Northern France and Belgium. It has likewise moved into the very front lines, especially in Normandy. Even when the "SS in Arms" does not take over key positions directly, command is given to the younger, ardently Nazi generals. This is the meaning of the selection of Colonel-General Heinz Guderian as chief of staff, combining the former function of three other men.

One important result of all this is that Hitler now has actual, formal control over the masses of the German soldiers.

To offset this, the purge has had for the Nazis one disastrous effect. It is a blow against the myth of unity in the conduct of the war. A crisis of confidence has begun which will certainly soon offset whatever temporary gains may have been made in the centralization of formal power. Probably for some time to come the Nazis will be able to suppress the symptoms of this crisis of confidence. But they will be unable to do so at the moment when support of the German people is needed most, when the enemy approaches and even crosses the border of Germany.

It is highly significant that no report from Germany has said anything about participation in the revolt by the civilian population. This was purely a struggle inside the army. One reason may have been that Himmler's secret police still have too tight a grip on the country as a whole. But a more important reason is probably the fact that the German people, even if they knew what was going on, would see in it only a quarrel between two sets of masters. The officers who revolted were certainly not opposed to Hitler on any sort of principle of morality. On the contrary, many of them had followed him for years. They revolted against him because they thought he was now a bad leader and for no other reason. To the masses of the people, the most significant fact is the end of the myth of fictitious unity at the top. Over and over again, Goebbels' propaganda has drummed it into their ears that the Germans are "all in the same boat." It now becomes obvious that there is mutiny on board. Realization of this is a necessary prerequisite to a real revolution, the sort that is made only with the aid of the masses themselves, when the workers and peasants at home and the soldiers at the front begin to stir.

It is not too difficult to liquidate a bungled *coup d'etat*; but you cannot liquidate doubts that have been implanted. If it is true, as Hitler himself has said, that the German army has been guided by traitors, how can the common soldier maintain unlimited confidence in his leaders? Many high-ranking German officers have been heard over the Moscow radio broadcasting to the German Army calling upon it to revolt; their number has included sixteen generals. This is a phenomenon never before witnessed in German history. It is bound to have shaken the confidence of all but the dullest-witted, or the most fanatical Nazis, among those still fighting in the field. Some of the German war prisoners who have been taken in Normandy are reported to have expressed satisfaction at the news of the attempt to kill Hitler.

Obviously a situation exists of which full advantage should and must be taken by the psychological warfare of the democracies. The next thing to happen will surely be a new and stronger wave of unrest in the German Army, as officers and troops begin to realize the seriousness of the situation and the terrible fate into which Hitler and the Nazis are prepared to lead them. That second wave can easily be the prelude to a people's revolt, as the rapidity of Allied successes increases and a German final defeat draws nearer at an accelerated peace.

KARL O. PAETEL

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Poland and Russia

THE BIRTH OF THE Polish Committee of National Liberation, godfathered by the Soviet Union, seems to sound the death-knell of the Polish Government-in-Exile in London. Offspring of the marriage between the Union of Polish Patriots in the USSR and the Polish National Council in Nazi-occupied Poland, the Committee's debut represents an admittedly unilateral solution of the Soviet-Polish conflict which could not be delayed any longer in view of the rapid advance of the Russian armies in Poland and the need for an authority to take over civil administration in the liberated areas. The decision of the Soviet government to charge the Committee with the administration of the freed territory also crystallizes the real issue of the dispute between the Soviet Union and the Polish Government-in-Exile which is not, as the latter advertises, the disagreement over Poland's frontiers with the USSR, but the future political coloration of the Polish state.[1]

The Soviet government, in its statement recognizing the Committee, declared that it considers Red Army operations in Poland "as operations on the territory of a sovereign, friendly, allied state," making possible the rout of the German armies and "the restoration of an independent, strong and democratic Poland." Stating that "it does not pursue aims of acquiring any part of Polish territory or of a change of social structure in Poland," the Soviet government seems to regard the frontier question as settled. While it promised not to change Poland's *social* structure, the Soviet government by concluding an agreement with the new Committee has taken an active hand in bringing about a change in her *political* regime.

The refusal of the Soviet Union to recognize the government-in-exile as the legitimate bearer of Polish sovereignty springs from Moscow's conviction that the exiled Polish politicos, once back at home in positions of power, would not be "good neighbors." There is indeed little in the Polish government's record to allay Russian suspicions. It has antagonized the Soviet Union by stupidly rejecting understandable Soviet demands for the ouster of its most vocal anti-Soviet personnel, men like President Wladislaw Raczkiewicz and Commander-in-Chief General Kazimierz Sosnkowski, or such lesser lights as Minister of War General Marjan Kukiel, Minister of Information Stanislaw Kot, and Foreign Minister Tadeusz Romer.[2]

These men, by playing up the frontier issue as the only point of friction, have sought to embarrass the Soviet government in its relations with Britain and the United States. Blindly they ignored Winston Churchill's last warning of February 22, 1944, when he told the House of Commons that he sympathized with the Russian position and that he did not feel "that the Russian demand for reassurances about her western frontiers goes beyond the limits of what is reasonable and just."

Hidden behind the government-in-exile's hostility are the social fears of Poland's reactionaries and socialists alike. They go back to the years immediately after the last war when the USSR did not loom so much as a land-hungry neighbor, but as a serious threat to Poland's social institutions, especially the large landed estates in eastern Poland, the Catholic Church and the socialist trade unions. The Soviet Union, of course, has long ago left the path of world revolutionary action. But the elements now constituting the Polish government, whether of the Right or Left, ossified in their hostility are unable to make the necessary adjustments.

The exiled government's unyielding position is to a large extent based on its influence among the Polish underground. It is precisely this influence to which the Soviet government objects. For as late as October 27, 1943, the government-in-exile, while ordering the underground to avoid conflict with the Soviet armies entering Poland, also issued instructions to enter into coöperation with Soviet commanders only "in the event of a resumption of Polish-Soviet relations." Subsequent orders to coöperate with the Red Army came too late. In April the Polish government was forced to request British and American intervention in Moscow to halt incidents between the advancing Red Army and Polish Soviet partisans on the one side and its own underground forces on the other, an admission that it did not completely control the Polish resistance movement.

Even before the break of diplomatic relations on April 25, 1943, Poles living in the USSR had formed the Union of Polish Patriots. Led by Wanda Wasilewska, wife of Soviet Vice-Commissar Alexander Korneichuk, the Union quickly grew from a nucleus of Communists into a larger organization in which non-Communists played an important part, including men like the Socialist Dr. Bronislaw Drobner and Andrzej Witos, formerly a member of the Central Committee of the Polish Peasant Party. A "Declaration of Principles," adopted at the Union's first congress on June 9-10, 1943, advocated a democratic and parliamentary constitution for Poland, an alliance with Russia, and the annexation of Silesia, the Corridor and East Prussia in exchange for the eastern provinces claimed by

[1] For a discussion of the frontier question, see Frederick L. Schuman, "The Polish Frontier," The New Republic, January 31, 1944, pp. 138-141.

[2] For more on the Polish government, see my article, "Europe's Exiled Governments," The New Republic, November 1, 1943, pp. 614-617.—H. E.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Soviet Union. A Polish Army was created in the Soviet Union. By May, 1944, it comprised four divisions under General Zigmund Berling. This army, superbly equipped, is now participating in the liberation of Poland and forms the military backbone of the Polish Committee of National Liberation.

Meanwhile, independent of the Union of Polish Patriots, the Polish National Council or Krajowa Rada Narodowa, was organized in occupied Poland by underground pro-Soviet and anti-governmental groups at a secret meeting on January 1, 1944. The Council appealed to the Polish people to disregard the instructions of the government-in-exile regarding reprisals against pro-Soviet guerrillas, announced recognition of the democratic constitution as against the dictatorial one of 1935, set up a series of provincial, town, county and rural councils, and addressed greetings to the Allied governments. General Rola-Zymierski, a professional soldier who had been opposed to the Pilsudski regime, was appointed commander-in-chief of the Council's military units.

Little was known of the Council until May, 1944, when two representatives arrived in Moscow to get into contact with the Union of Polish Patriots and the Polish Army as well as the Allied governments. Mr. Edward Osuska-Morawski, now head of the Committee of National Liberation, while giving assurances of the Council's backing by substantial sectors of the underground, did not minimize the strength of the groups still supporting the government-in-exile which, he reported, are well supplied with money and arms.

On July 1 the Union of Polish Patriots expressed its conviction that the Polish National Council provided the basis for a provisional government in Poland, Mr. Morawski was equally convinced that the Union did not nurse any ambition to usurp power without consulting the Polish people. The similarity of their programs with respect to postwar reforms and frontier adjustments facilitated the amalgamation of the Council and the Union in the Polish Committee of National Liberation which was announced on July 23.

Although the Committee has been anxious to emphasize its temporary functions, it was immediately denounced by exiled Polish circles as a body of "usurpers, nobodies, turncoats and Communists," or as a "typical puppet government imposed by Moscow." While the sponsorship of the Committee by the Soviet Union corresponds to the realities of power, its formation would have been difficult without the existence and consent of the Polish National Council which, as far as the evidence shows, is the spontaneous expression of anti-governmental forces in occupied Poland. The appointment of one of the Council's members to the chairmanship of the Liberation Committee, the subordination of General Berling under General Rola-Zymierski, the fact that the Council has been placed in charge of the Union of Polish Patriots and the Union's activities in Russia suggest the important role played by the Council in the creation of the Committee. The Committee itself is made up of members of the Council and the Union of Polish Patriots belonging to the Peasant, Socialist, Democratic and Communist parties.

The future offers a number of possibilities, none of which allows for the return to Poland of the government-in-exile as presently constituted. Only a radical revamping of its membership could pave the way for an agreement with the Committee of National Liberation, along the lines of the solution recently reached in Yugoslav politics. Intransigence on the part of the government-in-exile will mean its suicide; recognition would soon be withdrawn and given to the Liberation Committee as a provisional government. The hurried trip of Polish Premier Stanislaw Mikolajczyk to Russia and Moscow's willingness to receive him suggest that compromise may be possible, perhaps through the inclusion of less outspoken anti-Soviet exiled politicians in the Committee of National Liberation. While the inclusion of Poland in the USSR as a Union Soviet Republic has been discussed, it is unlikely in view of Anglo-American opposition. In any event, Poland will be in close alliance with the USSR and form an integral part of the security system which the Soviet Union is building up in Eastern Europe under her hegemony.

HEINZ H. F. EULAU

The Land Stacks Up

The land stacks up
It manages to hold its shape
I think we have not been too hard on hills
or scooped the valleys out too deep
We have taken timber, yes
logged a little heavily
but there is still oak in this country
there is elm
I see no reason for castigating ourselves
We have strangled rivers in our time
kicked a few creeks around
But I can show you streams where trout
still rise to fly
and water still can gnash its teeth
at root or rock
I do not advise a mass lament
We have ridden herd on mountains, sure
bridled them with wire and fence
but they are still mountains
they are blue
I see no reason for invoking doom
We have hacked away our share of sod
but corn still grows to customary height
has tassels, ears up well
barley still wears a beard
wheat's a crop
I do not envision the demise of earth
the land stacks up

PRESTON NEWMAN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Press and Public Opinion[1]

II: *The Formation of Opinion*

In the second of a series of two articles on the role of the press as a force in shaping public opinion, Dr. Gerhart Saenger further summarizes the results of a recent study made among New York City newspaper readers. – THE EDITORS

A RECENT survey of 300 newspaper readers in New York City strongly demonstrates the importance of the press in determining public opinion on the vital issues of the day.

Marked differences in opinion between News, Mirror and Journal-American readers and those preferring liberal papers—the Post and PM—are perhaps to be expected. More significant, however, are the differences between the readers of the reactionary press and those of the "middle-of-the-road," conservative press—The Times, Herald Tribune, Sun and World-Telegram. In spite of their conservative background, readers who prefer the four last-named papers include proportionately almost twice as many persons who desire more governmental control of business after the war than were found among the readers of the first three papers. In line with the attitudes of their papers, Times and Herald Tribune, Sun and World-Telegram readers are more internationally minded than are the readers of The News, Mirror and Journal-American.

The only issue on which the two reader groups see eye-to-eye is the question of social security. An increase of unemployment-insurance benefits after the war is advocated by about one-half the readers of both groups of papers, while almost all readers of the liberal press advocate such expansion of our social-security system. In general, readers of the conservative press are economically better off than those of other papers. Their opposition to an increased social-security program can therefore be explained in part by the fact that they would have to foot the bill for it through higher taxes. The News, Mirror and Journal-American, however, are read mainly by workers likely to profit from an expansion of the program. The explanation for their attitude is lack of foresight, coupled with the forgetting of past bad times and past experiences of unemployment, so typical of many workers today. Although one-half of all workers who were interviewed expected a depression after the war, only 10 percent of those expecting large-scale unemployment thought they would lose their jobs after the war.

How much of the difference in opinion between readers can be attributed to newspaper influence? Is it possible that economic differences are responsible? The results of the study suggest strongly that differences in readers' opinions were largely independent of economic differences. The business man who read The Times or The Herald Tribune was found to be more internationally minded than the one who preferred The News or The Mirror. The workers who read liberal or conservative papers expressed themselves as more in favor of government control of business than those reading the McCormick-Patterson or Hearst papers.

Mere proof of the influence of the press on the formation of public opinion does not suffice. We must know how many and what types of people are affected, and how to explain the relatively great effect of the press on different sections of the public.

Distribution figures determine the relative influence of a paper. In New York City the papers opposed to both government planning and international coöperation—The News, The Mirror and The Journal-American—have a daily circulation about 14 times as large as those favoring both planning and coöperation, *i. e.*, The Post and PM. The combined circulation of The Times, Herald Tribune, Sun and World-Telegram is smaller than that of The News alone. Even a slight change in opinion among the readers of The News and The Mirror as a result of their reading will thus affect a vastly larger number and be more important than a pronounced shift in opinion caused by reading The Post and PM.

The three papers with the largest distribution figures gave relatively little space to the NRPB and Beveridge reports, as compared to the rest of the New York press. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that while only a very small proportion of The News, Mirror and Journal-American readers (nine percent) were familiar with the NRPB report, more than four times as many (40 percent) of the readers of The Times, Herald Tribune, Sun and World-Telegram were acquainted with the report.

An analysis of newspaper preferences by occupation of readers revealed that manual workers prefer The News, Mirror and Journal-American; business men and professional workers like The Times, Herald Tribune, Sun and World-Telegram better. White-collar workers were found to read papers of all shades of opinion. Access to complete, unbiased information on planned social legislation, therefore, becomes largely a matter of economic differences. The postwar plans, with their provisions for added social security, job insurance and labor legislation, are most important for

[1] The author is indebted to the Social Research Laboratory of the City College of New York for statistical data included in his articles.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

domestic and factory workers, who are least secure. Yet, largely because of their newspaper preferences, they have little opportunity to learn about the topics most vital to them, and hence remain uninformed.

The widespread lack of information concerning important political issues among the lower-income groups is due not only to newspaper preferences. Their failure to make use of other media of communication, such as the radio, books, pamphlets and adult education, further aggravates the situation. Serious radio broadcasts, news and political speeches, find their main audience among the higher-income groups. Political pamphlets and books likewise have a small distribution among manual workers. Adult education in the lower-income groups is still in its beginnings. Union education is said to have alleviated the situation somewhat. Its effect, however, is often overestimated. The union workers interviewed in this study proved to be little better informed about the NRPB report than non-union workers; they did not differ from unorganized labor in their attitudes on international coöperation.

The combined effect of their newspaper-reading habits and their lack of access to other media of information in regard to social planning was found to be pronounced among the lower-income groups. Only two out of every 20 domestic workers and three of every 20 manual workers were familiar with the postwar plans. On the other hand, 10 out of every 20 white-collar workers and 16 out of every 20 business or professional men in the higher-income groups were familiar with them. In this connection it was interesting to see that News, Mirror and Journal-American readers not only know least about the reports, but also comprise the largest proportion of persons who could not decide which stand to take with regard to the specific proposals on postwar planning made in the study.

Mere knowledge of the plans was found to influence opinions. Persons who were familiar with the reports more often favored specific proposals for social improvements than those who had not read them. Most business and professional people who had read the reports favored government action to provide jobs for the unemployed after the war; those unfamiliar with the reports usually opposed this. In the professional group, continued price control for some time after the war was advocated by eight out of 10 readers familiar with the reports, but by only two out of 10 who had not heard about them. Manual workers familiar with the reports favored an extension of unemployment insurance more frequently than those not acquainted with the plans.

Regardless of a paper's attitude, the mere withholding or publicizing of specific legislative proposals or political programs suffices to influence public opinion. The Times, Herald Tribune, Sun and World-Telegram did not advocate adoption of the NRPB report by Congress; most of their articles opposed it. But their readers at least had an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the actual text of the report and were able to form their own judgments of its merits.

The importance of factual information in the formation of public opinion has also become obvious through the results of most national opinion polls taken during recent years. The better educated, better informed parts of the American public show a more favorable attitude toward international coöperation, are more internationally minded, than the more poorly educated groups. In the present study, the largest proportion of "isolationists" was found among those who did not go beyond grammar school.

Any argument concerning the relative influence of the press is incomplete unless one considers the individual motivations which lead to a preference for a particular newspaper. It has been claimed that most persons select a paper because they agree with its editorial policy, and that the great popularity of the anti-administration press in New York City reflects a genuine anti-administration trend. Actually, while most readers of the liberal press choose their papers for their political color, others are chosen more frequently for entirely different reasons. Although many read The Times and The Herald Tribune for their editorial policy, others choose them for their superior news coverage, their business and financial pages, their good reporting of scientific, civic and social events, and features such as the book-review or music section.

It is not likely that the majority of the readers of the popular press, The News, Mirror and Journal-American, select these papers because of their editorial policy. They are attracted by special features, such as comic strips, extensive reports of sensational news, etc. The News, with a daily distribution figure of more than two millions, backed the administration's domestic and foreign policy until a few years ago and then changed its policy within the period of a few weeks. The fact that its popularity did not decrease or its type of reader change is convincing proof that The News is not bought for its editorial policy. In fact, the majority of its readers, most of them members of the lower-income classes, are among the steadiest supporters of the administration.

Thus the influence of the press is not large enough to swing elections in times when the issues are clear-cut and an overwhelming sentiment for one candidate exists. The main influence of the press lies in its power to influence public opinion with regard to the somewhat remote, but nevertheless vital, issues of America's future domestic and international policy. In New York City a majority of the people are exposed to propaganda that opposes governmental domestic planning and international coöperation, and have little or no opportunity to become acquainted with a progressive, liberal point of view through other sources of information.

GERHART SAENGER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Clayton and the NAM

SOMETIMES I almost lose faith in the NAM and the Chamber of Commerce. I had always believed that those two worthy organizations were against government agencies established by the President without authority from Congress—especially those established by FDR. But when James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, began asking embarrassing questions about W. L. Clayton, Surplus War Property Administrator, he received not a word of support from the NAM or the Chamber of Commerce. Yet Patton was viewing with alarm an executive agency created by an executive order. Patton wanted the agency to be established under laws written by Congress. He endorsed, as a means to that end, the Kilgore demobilization bill which creates a Surplus War Property Administration and sets forth in detail the powers and duties of the administrator. But, I have discovered, the NAM and the Chamber of Commerce are against the Kilgore bill.

The reason is not hard to find. Clayton formerly was president of Anderson, Clayton and Company, one of the great cotton exporters. He has never joined an organization abhorrent to his fellow Texan, Martin Dies. In 1936 he was a Liberty Leaguer. For several years he has been Jesse Jones's right-hand man in the RFC and the Department of Commerce. Now, as Surplus War Property Administrator, he has one of the most important positions in Washington. It is in his power to do more postwar planning than almost anyone else in Washington. Monopolies can be made or broken by him. Thousands of men can be given or denied jobs as a result of Will Clayton's decisions. It is estimated he will have supervision over the disposal of $103 billion worth of government property.

One of his first decisions has horrified persons who do not want the banker mentality to rule the America of the future. It is estimated that after the war the government will sell some eight million acres of farm land. Clayton has decided that the proper agency to handle the sales is the RFC. The Washington Post, an intelligent and conservative paper, said that Clayton might as reasonably allocate the disposal of surplus factories to the Office of Indian Affairs or the disposal of surplus ships to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. What does the RFC know about farming? "All signs," says The Post, "point ominously to the danger that this land will be dumped indiscriminately at auction into the hands of speculators and wealthy absentee owners."

Patton has called on Congress to negate Clayton's order and turn the job over to the Farm Security Administration in the Department of Agriculture. Both Patton and Norman M. Littell, assistant attorney general in charge of the lands division of the Department of Justice, have suggested that Clayton's action was the direct result of influence from the National Association of Real Estate Boards. Patton said that the action was "calculated to enrich private real-estate interests" to the detriment of a sound land program. "This is bad enough," Patton said, "when it relates to urban real estate, but when it relates to farm land, which involves the permanency of a fundamental national resource, such domination is intolerable."

Why the President approved Will Clayton for the post is among the Rooseveltian unexplainables. If ever there was a challenge to liberal forces to organize and demand an official's removal, this is it.

After his recent return from England, J. Loy Maloney, managing editor of The Chicago Tribune, wrote a sorrowful article in Editor and Publisher over the sad state of the British press, dominated, he found, by the aristocracy. The article should have appeared in The New Yorker. It was uproariously funny. A sample: "The circumstance which most shocks the American newspaperman in London," this Tribune man wrote, "is the interlarding of the news with the opinions of the newspaper editor and his reporters. This mixing of opinion and fact has been practiced so long that the reporters and editors are past masters of the art. . . . The editorial opinion injected into the news stories acts as a drug on the reader and the first thing he knows he is swallowing it."

If President Roosevelt and Senator Truman can carry the Solid South plus the states which Vice President Wallace carried on the first ballot in Chicago, the Democratic ticket will win easily in November. With the exception of New York and Illinois, Wallace carried all the really important states. Among them were Connecticut, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Colorado, Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio, Washington, Oregon and California.

It may or may not be significant but it is worth noting, that the revolt against Hitler began among his officers on the Russian front. And Russia is the only country at war with Germany which has attempted to use propaganda as well as bullets against the Nazis. Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill, despite repeated and insistent suggestions from responsible persons, have been disdainful of propaganda. They have refused to talk about war aims.

Since before Pearl Harbor, the President has followed a policy of being seen and heard as little as possible. He has no more attempted to lead opinion at home than he has attempted to arouse it in enemy countries. When the war was young his answer was that we were in no position to publish war aims until victory was more certain. Now the progress of Allied arms is substantial, but apparently Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill do not wish to commit themselves in any manner. Stalin has not weighed himself down with commitments, yet he has hammered away relentlessly at the German armies and the German people with shrewd and apparently effective propaganda. Everyone knows the effect the Wilsonian appeals had in the last war.

Perhaps Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill are right when they say that only bullets count. But they cannot prove their case because they have not tried anything else. How can they doubt that their voices would strengthen the anti-Hitler factions in Germany? The cost and trouble of trying would not compare with a day's expenditure of effort in the front lines.

Washington T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It Comes Up Corn

THE FILMING of Pearl Buck's novel, "Dragon Seed," follows a familiar path in occupied-nations films; starting with a good, peaceful folk—those of Nanking, but mainly farmer Ling Tan's family—being subjugated by the Japanese, their learning the nature of the war, the enemy, and their own Quislings, and ending with their guerrilla tactics against the enemy. It is full of the right kind of war thought for a brotherhood of nations. Also it is less innocent than most movies about the consequences of war, when its hero finds he cannot kill, nor stomach the fact that so many of his people are becoming as bloodthirsty as the enemy. All of this would be significant, even at this late date, if it came out the kind of life you can generally believe or find in any newsreel shot from Occupied China. Still as a romantic, syrupy picture of China today, I think you will find it more human and effective than many other romantic Hollywood films.

"Dragon Seed" misses creating an intrinsic Chinese existence and people, as well as a convincing Japanese, by as thorough a mile as a nation's character can be missed by a movie, even by one that is spending two million dollars to be accurate. Visually, everything about it is too beautiful and plush. The farming lands of Ling Tan and his neighbors are as idyllic as an Italian landscape in a Renaissance painting, and are made more so by giving the film a golden sheen by shooting it in sepia: the whole effect achieves the splendid, rarified atmosphere of a fairy land rather than of farm land. Even the real Chinese adults who are used as extras to stream across Ling Tan's land carrying factories inland or as Japanese soldiers, and the real Chinese children, are combed and curried to such a fine state that they look no less glamorous, or no more like homemade Chinese, than the main people—Katharine Hepburn, Walter Huston, Aline MacMahon. The sentiment of too many of the events tends toward a similar kind of romantic overstatement: the Japanese officer who is about to rape the young Chinese mother is given a set of those practical-joker's teeth to make him too obviously ape-like; the girl in turn is several steps too prettily dainty; the earth-scorching at the end is done with an arsonist's relish and with enough fire to burn the city of Chicago; Jade's and Lao Er's lovemaking is on the level of newspaper poetry in its stylized winsomeness and plitty-Chinee qualities; Jade's poisoning of the Japanese officers is glamorized to an unreal point. On the sound track is every possible kind of accent, including Akim Tamiroff's borscht tones saying gowermunt for government, a starched dialogue full of wisdom and about as human as cork, and refined, pretty tunes and marching songs that have their roots in Tin Pan Alley and the Almanac Singers.

"Dragon Seed" still ends up weighing substantially more than is common for a Hollywood epic, having a more compact, definite form and a few things that are very warm and human. For one thing, it covers more existence in less time than usual, getting a variety of feelings, problems and philosophies, from that of the third son (Hurd Hatfield), who turns from a sensitive, fainthearted youth to a butchering guerrilla, to that of the third cousin (Henry Travers), who is the ineffectual scholar and doesn't turn into anything. And it does this without the tedium produced by too little cutting, or the heavy flow of sentiment you get in a picture like Selznick's "Since You Went Away." Some of the most domestic parts of the film are done very accurately. The love of the mother (Aline MacMahon) for the other members of the family has enough greed and domination mixed in its fierceness to produce the right insidiousness, while still seeming like a generous kind of love. The relationship between her and the old farmer is lusty enough for all of its ideal prettiness, and the children and babies in the film are grasped, fondled and bounced with a genuine love. The rest of the humanity is contributed by the acting.

Walter Huston's Ling Tang is the one character who seems visually without any kind of artificiality or trace of Hollywood. The role is one of the most common war-movie characters, the good peaceful man who is bewildered and sickened by the war and struggles to understand it. But it is played here probably better than it ever has been before, with a believable amount of pain, puzzlement and goodness. Miss MacMahon's mother has a lot of mother in it, even if it seems grown in Brooklyn rather than the Orient. Miss Hepburn is like a well bred New England razor blade, but strikes many feelings off in a clear ,brilliant way. Her mate (Turhan Bey) has a loping walk, the manner of a pampered American college boy, and the misfortune, with Hepburn, to be looked at consistently through the eyes of a director or photographer who should be making Christmas cards.

MANNY FARBER

The Bandwagon

Both [Mr. and Mrs. Humphrey Bogart] are unpretentious and their pleasures are simple and childlike. Whatever free time they have is spent aboard their 30-ft. cruiser, Sluggy. – *From an article in Life.*

The only way to reduce war to a minimum is to have a private-property free-enterprise economy with a minimum of government. Note where the big wars start, who starts them, and why. The government-dominated economies of Germany, Russia and Japan, this time—as always. That is all there is to it. – *Isabel Paterson in "Turns with a Bookworm" in the New York Herald Tribune Books.*

Brave New World
"FUTURE UNLIMITED!"
Now Running on 10 Stations
Preview news from America's greatest manufacturers
Escapist Entertainment
The low-down on postwar miracles to come, with a
little Free Enterprise mixed in
SUITABLE FOR ANY TYPE SPONSOR
– *Card sent out by the Raymond Keane Syndicated Radio Programs, Denver, Colorado.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – THE EDITORS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

Mr. Loeb and Mr. Willkie

SIR: At a time when so many people are neither where they were nor what they were before, and when it is a common saying that little of the world we knew will ever be the same again, it is heartening to see any ray of hope for the end to become better and not worse than the beginning. Mr. Loeb's letter to Mr. Willkie in your July 17 issue shows one such ray. Not only will many thinking persons appreciate the justice and wisdom of his remarks, but the real encouragement comes from the reflection that we have on the political stage a man of Mr Willkie's moral and intellectual stature, that it is likely he will read such a letter as Mr. Loeb's, and that it is possible, if our hopes are realized, that he could follow, even without prompting, a course of action such as Mr. Loeb suggests. What needs doing *can* be done when there is a man who is both morally and otherwise capable of doing it.

Los Angeles, Calif. MYRON H. BROOMELL

How to Vote

SIR: My first two issues of The New Republic have just arrived. I have figuratively devoured them. Real news about the home front is quite a blessing and I am most thankful. Your May 8 supplement on "A Congress to Win the War and the Peace" tells me how to vote, whereas I have had no other real information on what my Congressmen from Texas have been up to since I left the States. Now all I have to do is figure out a way to get a ballot. A request for information to the authorities in said state three months ago remains unanswered. *C'est la guerre*, or something. Anyhow, thanks.

Somewhere in Italy LT. D. H. D.

Constitutional Change

SIR: The Republican Party has, in the past ten years, disapproved of any change in the Constitution. Now in this crucial period, however, it has pledged in its platform to support an amendment to that sacred document limiting the tenure of office of President to two terms.

If its desire for good government is sincere, a very consistent additional change would be to limit the tenures of office of Senators and Representatives to two and three terms respectively, thereby removing most of the deadwood in both Houses and eliminating our greatest handicap to progress.

San Marino, Calif. JOHN STUART

Postwar Housing Scheme

SIR: One of the leading national real-estate organizations has coyly suggested that private companies be permitted to issue tax-exempt securities to raise money for housing projects after the war.

The obvious criticism of that idea is that it would provide another way for people of means to avoid paying part of their share of the taxes. Another fault lies in the fact that such securities would probably yield four or five percent interest, which would definitely preclude housing for the low-income group.

Instead of permitting private companies to issue tax-exempt bonds for new construction, I suggest that the government supply loans for housing through money raised by the issue and sale of a special type of Treasury bond earmarked for that purpose. The bonds would *not* be tax-exempt, and would yield perhaps 2.5 percent interest on terms of ready redeemability (but would not be negotiable); and they would be issued primarily—or solely—through a peacetime continuation of the payroll-savings program now centered on Series "E" War Bonds.

Money derived from the sale of these securities would be loaned to private, public or coöperative agencies to be used for building *low-cost* homes, at an interest rate just enough higher than the borrowing rate to pay administrative costs, with all loans made on a guarantee of a certain rental scale to ensure benefit to those who need low-cost housing, and with such guarantees as to quality and workmanship as experience with FHA operations indicates are desirable.

Denver, Colo. THEODORE WILSON

Against Administrative Absolutism

SIR: The American Bar Association's proposed federal code of procedure deserves the thoughtful attention of everyone interested in good government. Here is a bill upon which liberals and conservatives can unite. The Bar Association has not concerned itself with the powers or functions of any administrative agency. All it has tried to do is to guarantee due process in administrative procedure. In substance, the Bar Association's bill provides for adequate publicity for administrative regulations, public participation in administrative rule-making, fair and impartial hearings, and a court review, not to determine facts, but to ascertain if the administrative body has kept within its powers and has followed the stipulated procedure. The Bar Association recognizes administrative tribunals as essential. Its purpose is merely to protect the citizen from administrative absolutism.

Columbia University, New York City JOHN HANNA

From The New Republic Mail Bag

The American Association of Scientific Workers sends us a copy of an "Appeal to the Scientists of the World," a plea for coöperation in the war against fascism drafted by the third annual meeting of the Soviet Scientists' Anti-Fascist Committee. "Let the intellectual and the scientist," the document urges, "contribute [their] share to the common cause of humanity by intensive creative effort."

Louis J. Schwab, Peoria, Illinois, writes concerning a scheme for providing postwar employment by the construction of giant warehouses, to be filled with basic commodities sufficient to supply a two-year national need. The plan would be financed by adding these basic commodities to the actual gold and silver now backing our money, and issuing warehouse receipts in the form of currency certificates.

Nathan D. Shapiro, of Brooklyn, New York, writes to us apropos of the current Finnish peace talks. He believes that "Russia would save much in Russian lives as well as in prestige if she permitted the disillusioned German soldiers . . . in Finland to go back to Germany. . . . They surely would not be worth the Russian lives required [to invade and conquer Finland] and to intern the German soldiers [stationed there] . . ."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

The Road to Peace

I MUST BEGIN with an apology to the authors and to my readers. Among the innumerable books which discuss the problems of peace, a few are cranky and many are trite. It is a miracle to find in the same batch four volumes of such outstanding merit. Each would deserve more space than I can devote to the four. In despair, I am tempted to limit my review to a single bit of advice: "Read and ponder."

I really have nothing else to say about "Russia and the Peace,"[1] by Sir Bernard Pares. It is a model of concise, pertinent, readable information. It is not an encyclopedia of Russian history and culture: it gives the educated reader exactly what he wants to know about Russia as a factor in world politics. Sir Bernard has been a student of Russian affairs for nearly half a century. In the darkest days, he never lost his faith in the Russian people. He never lost his critical sense either. He is not a retained advocate defending at times Holy Russia, at times the literal inspiration of Marxism, at times the inerrancy of Joseph Stalin. "We shall," he advises us, "stand up to [Russia], and we shall expect her to do the same to us, but we shall seek a solid and workmanlike solution, based on serious and sympathetic study, for every problem that may face us." This is also the attitude of Joseph Davies, to whom the book is dedicated.

Sir Bernard notes that communism is not a perfected, unquestioned system in Soviet Russia. He notes also a tremendous resurgence of patriotism—that democratic faith in the country's destiny that was so obviously lacking in the First World War. He does not consider this development as a recantation of Lenin's ideal. Communism is now a goal to be attained through patient effort, not a regime to be established overnight by the fiat of a few supermen. Communism, like Christianity, must be deserved: a hard task and a high reward. Russia, without fully confessing it, has in fact sloughed off the Marxian delusions of "ineluctable processes" and total upheaval. But, if Pares is to be trusted, she is not ready to move, repentant, into the Hooverian fold. Agrarian collectivism is an ancient reality with her; and there has always been an element of Messianic universality in her soul, as in the soul of all nations that are truly great. Communism, as distinct from Marxism and Bolshevism, is not on the wane. It is not a menace but a challenge. We shall have to contend with it, not by suppressing the party and the name, as Messrs. Martin Dies and Walter Lippmann advocate, but by watching and matching its achievements.

"The Great Decision,"[2] by James T. Shotwell, is likewise a remarkable compendium of a vast subject, by the very best authority. It gives us the recent history, the current problems, and the prospects of world organization for durable peace. Dr. Shotwell was active in the Paris Conference twenty-five years ago; as writer, investigator, editor, organizer, he has been the most faithful worker in that field ever since. Between history and distant planning, Dr. Shotwell places in their proper light and perspective the declarations and efforts of the Allied leaders today.

There is much confusion: but there is the possibility of an emergent pattern. Evidently, Dr. Shotwell would, in a number of cases, have preferred a bolder policy. The common man is definitely ahead of his alleged guides, and particularly ahead of Congress or the press. We should have had long ago a Council of the United Nations. The enthusiasm for the common cause, the necessity for unselfish effort, provided the best conditions for creating—more accurately, for recognizing—the World Commonwealth. The task grows harder as victory becomes more certain. It will be hardest when Germany and Japan collapse. There may be a perilous gap between the wisdom born of fear and the wisdom born of hope.

The other two books are of a different nature. Well informed, their chief aim is not to impart information. William Fox[3] explores a problem; Walter Lippmann[4] advocates a solution. Both are highly controversial; both are extremely well done: a perfect recipe for the reader's enjoyment. Both writers are so conservative in their outlook that the word reactionary would not be a misnomer; and "reactionary" is in many cases a good synonym for "unrealistic." But I find more pleasure and profit in sharp disagreement with Messrs. Fox and Lippmann than in vague sympathy with the muddle-headed.

There is one point with which I am—not without reluctance—at one with both: we still have to think in terms of power and of diplomacy. There is at present no possibility for a world government that would be an actual superstate; and unless there be a superstate, there can be no international law, no justice, no police, exactly corresponding with law, justice and police within the nation. I do not gloat over the fact; I do not believe with Mortimer Adler that it will take us five hundred years to become civilized: a third world war twenty years hence may be sufficient to teach us wisdom. The reign of law, which is the essential condition of peace, implies that the minority will peacefully accept the decision of the majority: "ballots, not bullets; counting heads rather than breaking them." Now there is no way of making universal democracy safe for the United States: we are not ready for

[1] Russia and the Peace, by Bernard Pares. New York: The Macmillan Company. 293 pages. $2.50.

[2] The Great Decision, by James T. Shotwell. New York: The Macmillan Company. 268 pages. $3.

[3] The Super-Powers, by William T. R. Fox. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company. 184 pages. $2.

[4] United States War Aims, by Walter Lippmann. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. An Atlantic Monthly Press Book. 235 pages. $1.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

majority rule. No world parliament could impose upon us the full racial equality which is inscribed in our Constitution. No world parliament could force us to establish or destroy a religion. No world parliament could interpret for us Articles 4, 5 or 6 of the defunct Atlantic Charter. We do not want to share the wealth or share the land. We are a privileged minority, and privilege cannot be maintained except by force.

This does not imply that Messrs. Lippmann and Fox, as well as myself, do not believe in the possibility of a durable peace. There is a world community, although as yet there can be no world state. But such a peace will depend neither upon abstract principles nor upon formal institutions, it will have to be maintained by constant adjustments between ideals and interests, with force as the steadying factor.

Walter Lippmann's special contribution was already contained in his "United States Foreign Policy": it is the conception of an Atlantic community which embraces the Americas and the western fringe of Europe, particularly England and France. A very attractive idea. Here geography agrees with politics: the Atlantic world is also that of liberal plutodemocracy, the basis of Streit's "Union Now." According to that doctrine, our frontier is literally on the Rhine—which will horrify Oshkosh and Peoria. Aye: but have we not found that the key to the Rhine is in Czecho-Slovakia?

Beyond his Atlantic community, Walter Lippmann becomes weak and vague. For the region between Germany and the Soviets, he advocates a "Russian Orbit": Poland, Rumania, Finland must not cross Russia's path, or else. . . . This is Hitlerism of the purest brand: Germany struck at Czecho-Slovakia and Poland because they had refused to become satellites. If they are enslaved, they shall struggle until they are free again. (I give the Baltic republics the benefit of the doubt; maybe they swam of their own accord into Russia's gently smiling jaws.) Is not Winston Churchill as good a model for our "realists" as Adolf Hitler? According to their rule, Ireland ought to be brought back forcibly into the British system; Great Britain, even at the hour of greatest danger, gave up any thought of coercing her into submission.

On the crucial problem—the future of Germany—Lippmann and Fox have nothing definite to offer. They both take it for granted that Germany must not be integrated into a European federation. There is no sign of their ever challenging their own postulate. I for one believe that Germany would be far more dangerous in snarling isolation than within the liberal system. We are fighting the "New Order" because it is the wrong kind of order, brutal, imposed by crude barbarians; we should welcome a New Order, if it were, in the spirit of Hugo and Briand, a free union among equals. In an armed coalition of independent powers, Germany would no doubt assume control: not so within an organic union, not founded upon the sword. I think the President was far wiser than Messrs. Lippmann and Fox when he said: "The United Nations have no intention to enslave the German people. We wish them to have a normal chance to develop, in peace, as useful members of the European family."

The title: "The Super-Powers: The United States, Britain and the Soviet Union: Their Responsibility for Peace," does not do full justice to William Fox's book. The author goes far beyond that doctrine of the Big Three which, to my mind, is a crude fallacy. (He is honest enough not to speak of the Big Four: as Lin Yutang has so clearly told us, the inclusion of China is a mockery.) William Fox takes the notion of power, in its most elementary form, for granted: a squirrel is not an elephant, and I am not Joe Louis. But he analyzes shrewdly the various "Great Powers." At one time, they were eight. When Germany and Japan are disposed of, there will be only three—until a readjustment takes place. He is concerned with that period of tri-condominium, which may be brief. The word power has many connotations. China has an enormous power to endure; Germany had a tremendous power to strike. England is no match for either Russia or Germany on land; Russia at the peak of her naval strength barely reached secondary rank. Power is to a large extent will power: an appeasing, isolationist or "soft" nation will be a feeble giant in the power game. Power is prestige, the opinion of others: a relapse into normalcy of the Harding type would reduce our power. A drastic purge or a bold reconstruction plan will either diminish or enhance Russia's power. Leadership creates power, although never *ex nihilo:* at opposite poles, Hitler, de Gaulle and Churchill illustrate that point. Principles are elements of power. Lippmann knows it: I am afraid he is a sad Do-gooder at heart, for he closes with a Hymn to America's Destiny which is not unworthy of Longfellow's "Excelsior"! Even diplomacy is power: Talleyrand obtained for royal France the place in Europe's counsels which the Napoleonic armies had just forfeited.

To say: "We can build a hundred thousand planes a year," does not tell the whole story. The problem is whether a people has the wit and the heart to use its varied elements of strength even for the elementary purpose of self-preservation. I hope I shall some day be able to express my contempt for the Great Powers idea. In concrete terms, it means: "You, Holland, claim to be heard? Where is your gun?" It is the gangster's argument. Although it is "tough," it is not "realistic." Compare these two sets of facts. Versailles was the triumph of the Big Three, Munich that of the Big Four: Messrs. Lippmann and Fox want to avert war by the methods which have "averted" the Second World War. On the other hand, three great federations have proved their vitality: ours, the USSR and the British Commonwealth. Not one recognizes a difference *in status* between the strong and the weak. Nevada enjoys the same rights as New York: in fact, Nevada is artificially favored. Latvia is coequal with Great-Russia. New Zealand accepts no dictation from England. These rights are not empty formulas. We had a President from New Jersey, which is not one of our Big Four. One of the Elder Statesmen of the British Empire is Marshal Smuts, who represents a defeated people within one of the dominions. Stalin is a Georgian, not a Muscovite. Give me a world organized in such a way that Messrs. Benes or Hambro will have the same chance of attaining power as a Marquess of Hartington or a gentleman from Winesburg, Ohio, and I shall be satisfied.

ALBERT GUÉRARD

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Henry Wallace's Democracy

Democracy Reborn, by Henry A. Wallace. With an Intimate Profile by Russell Lord. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock. 274 pages. $3.

"DEMOCRACY REBORN" is a collection of the speeches and writings of Henry Wallace, some of which go back to 1932 and 1933, when he became Secretary of Agriculture. This is a valuable collection: first, because it is a contribution to the understanding of a human being who has become a statesman; and second, because it drives into the minds of the American people certain truths which Mr. Wallace makes clear as no other statesman in this period has done.

The introduction written by the editor, Russell Lord, is an essential part of the book. Mr. Lord reveals the background and hereditary influence which illumines the personality of the Vice President. Some of his ideas are better understood today because of the knowledge of what his grandfather was, and Mr. Wallace's extensive training in journalism and in the technique of scientific experiment help one to understand the patience which he showed as Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Wallace never was a politician and is not a very good one now, but he has long been a thinker and writer. That is why his speeches, until very recently, read much better than they sound. He has had to become a speaker.

If one were to pick out the one outstanding and continuing theme of all that Wallace says, it is his belief that whatever is done, must be done for the general welfare of the majority of the people. This belief colors his attitude on domestic as well as international problems.

You will hear people say that they are afraid of Henry Wallace because he is a dreamer, an impractical person, a mystic. No one who reads these speeches attentively would be afraid on any of these counts. They would recognize instead a man of curiosity, of deep religious feeling, not bound by any particular doctrine. They would know that he had to be practical because his scientific training was too intense to allow loose thinking. They would know that out of his background, nothing which was not truly American could possibly grow. He has traditional American attitudes on so many things that this fear of him which has been implanted in some people's minds, will seem strange to anyone who reads him carefully.

He is a realist. In 1933 he recognized that he could not embark on the realization of his own theory of abundance until he had cleared away the wreckage left by the past, and changed the political and economic philosophy which had preceded him. That is the attitude of a practical, straight thinking person.

There is a unity of thought in what he writes about the hopes the American people have for the future. It runs through every year of his life. Back in 1933 we find him saying:

> In brief, then, we wish a wider and better controlled use of engineering and science to the end that man may have a much higher percentage of his energy left over to enjoy the things which are non-material and non-economic, and I would include in this not only music, painting, literature and sport for sport's sake, but I would particularly include the idle curiosity of the scientist himself. Even the most enthusiastic engineers and scientists should be heartily desirous of bending their talents to serve these higher human ends. If the social will does not recognize these ends, at this particular stage in history, there is grave danger that Spengler may be proved right after all, and a thousand years hence a new civilization will be budding forth after this one has long lain fallow in a relative Middle Ages.

And in 1944 we find the following:

> Big business must not have such control of Congress and the executive branch of government as to make it easy for them to write the rules of the postwar game in a way which will shut out the men who have made such a magnificent contribution to the productive power of America during the war. We need them to furnish the jobs which are so important both to labor and to agriculture.
>
> The big three—Big Business, Big Labor and Big Agriculture—if they struggle to grab federal power for monopolistic purposes, are certain to come into serious conflict unless they recognize the superior claims of the general welfare of the common man. Such recognition of the general welfare must be genuine, must be more than polite mouthing of high-sounding phrases. Each . . . has unprecedented power at the present time. Each is faced with serious postwar worries. Each will be tempted to try to profit at the expense of the other two when the postwar boom breaks. Each can save itself only if it learns to work with the other two and with government in terms of the general welfare. To work together without slipping into an American fascism will be the central problem of postwar democracy.

The most revealing speech from the point of view of the man himself, his tenderness and sensitivity, is the one made at the commencement exercises of the Connecticut College for Women. His mind was wholly engrossed with the death of the son of his good friend, Milo Perkins, a boy whom he had known and loved. This boy had pointed out that though young men fight wars, it is fifteen or twenty years before they come to the position where they really control the postwar activity, or the political climate in which the results of the war are really accomplished. The boy wondered and doubted whether the older men in power would make the kind of a peace he was willing to fight for. Henry Wallace points out the responsibility of the older generation and then appeals to the youth coming out of college, urging them to grasp their responsibilities and carry out the duties which a people assume when they govern themselves.

In 1942 Mr. Wallace cited the four duties of the American people as he saw them. We were in the war and this was the peoples' pact:

> The duty to produce to the limit.
>
> The duty to transport these products as rapidly as possible to the field of battle.
>
> The duty to fight with all that is in us.
>
> The duty to build a peace—just, charitable and enduring.

In 1943 he defined the responsibilities of the peace. He lists for us the six assets which will be ours when the war comes to an end:

> Manpower by the million: skilled workers from war industries, military manpower and young people coming of working age.
>
> The largest industrial plant capacity in the world.
>
> The greatest resources, both natural and artificial, to make

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peacetime products—and thousands of new inventions waiting to be converted to peacetime use.

The largest scientific farm plant in the world.

The biggest backlog of requirements for housing, transportation, communications and living comforts.

The greatest reserve of accumulated savings by individuals that any nation has ever known.

Vice President Wallace found Mr. David Lilienthal's book on the TVA[1] one of the most exciting books he had read in the past year. That in itself is another key to the personality of Henry Wallace. He warns us of the possible danger of American fascism. He knows our weaknesses, he knows our temptations, but he has a deep-seated faith in the common sense, idealism and purpose which our people have. As far back as 1940 he said, "There has continually flamed in the hearts of Americans the belief that this continent is different. On this new soil, we have thought, mankind would escape from the compulsions, the suspicions and the greeds of the Old World."

But Mr. Wallace knows that we have to grow with the times and he is trying to point out the way we must travel. I hope many people will read his collection of speeches, for I doubt that it would be possible in any other way to get the full impact of his belief that successful democracy must have an underpinning of religious belief, and that the future, which may be a glorious one, depends on what we in America think and feel and determine to do. He believes in individual responsibility, but he knows that unless we work for the good of the common man there is no future for any of us. MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

A Reader's List

SOCIOLOGY OF RELIGION, by Joachim Wach (University of Chicago, $5). In spite of the triumph of science in the last three hundred years, religion continues to be one of the major integrating social forces in the modern world. The author, formerly a German professor but now in this country, has succeeded in presenting a succinct and surprisingly readable summary of the findings of theologians, anthropologists and social scientists on the interrelation of religion and society in different cultures and ages. Examining the part played by religion in the formation and transformation of society, and the effect of social organization and stratification on religion, the author arrives at a working typology of religious groups, their cult expression, leadership and symbols of integration. The volume is distinguished by its author's careful effort to refrain from explicit value judgments in a field in which normative evaluations have been traditional obstacles to scientific insight.

INTERVENTION AT ARCHANGEL, by Leonid Strakhovsky (Princeton, $3). A scholarly reminder, based on the ill fated Allied intervention in north Russia after the last war, this book should be a warning that interference with genuine revolutionary situations is playing with fire. The author believes that from the purely military point of view, as an anti-German move, the intervention was eminently successful. But as a counter-revolutionary venture it was an utter failure. The reason for this failure, it seems, was the fact that, according to a British source, "in no Allied country has there been a sufficient weight of public opinion to justify armed intervention against the Bolsheviks on a decisive scale, with the inevitable result that military operations have lacked cohesion and purpose." There is indeed much the Allies could have learned from the intervention at Archangel when they invaded North Africa and Italy. But they did not. Once more governmental policy, not backed by public opinion, ended in political failure.

LABOR'S AIMS IN WAR AND PEACE, by Amy Hewes (Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, 10 cents). Composed primarily for labor-education groups, this concise and clearly written pamphlet presents labor's views on the organization of society after the war. Miss Hewes asserts that an understanding of postwar goals will facilitate unified action for a better world. Such goals are set forth as an expansion of social security, a broad economic and social base so that "the great human treasures of art and science and religion" may be enjoyed by the common man, and labor's democratic participation in the industrial order. The methods suggested to achieve these worthwhile aims are education and labor-management coöperation. Yet one wonders whether such mild devices will be sufficient in the coming rush for economic and political power.

[1] Vice President Wallace reviewed Mr. Lilienthal's book in The New Republic of March 27, 1944.

Corrections

Due to a delay in the mails, the following alteration was not made in Seymour E. Harris' article, "The Broader Issues of Bretton Woods" [The New Republic, July 31]. The paragraph regarding Britain's postwar export trade should read as follows: "Export trade should account for at least 12 percent of Britain's national income in the postwar world. And if, with a full-employment income, world imports respond in the expected manner her export trade may well rise to 14 to 16 percent of her national income . . ."

In an editorial entitled "Victory in Canada" [The New Republic, July 3] a statement was made to the effect that the Coöperative Commonwealth Federation is the official opposition in the Canadian province of Quebec. This statement is in error. The two major opposition parties in Quebec are the Bloc Populaire and the Union Nationale.—THE EDITORS

Contributors

GERHART SAENGER is the assistant director of the Social Research Laboratory at the City College of New York. He has contributed articles to Survey Graphic, The Journal of Social Psychology and The Sociological Review.

KARL O. PAETEL is an anti-Nazi German writer now living in New York. He has specialized in research on German Army problems, the history and ideology of Nazism, and the military branch of the SS. He is preparing a book on the conflict between the military branch of the SS and the regular German Army.

PRESTON NEWMAN is an instructor in English at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. His verse has appeared in Poetry, The Lyric, The Nation and The New Republic.

ALBERT GUÉRARD, a member of the faculty of Stanford University, is the author of several books on French civilization, including "France of Tomorrow," published last year. He has just completed the manuscript of a new book, "Europe: Free and United."

MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, if anyone has any doubt about it, is the wife of the President of the United States.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED